

REMARKS

Claims 1, 32, and 45 have been amended. Claim 29 has been canceled. No claims have been added. Accordingly, after entry of this Amendment, claims 1-28 and 30-72 will remain pending.

In the non-final Office Action dated September 12, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 9-21, 24, 25, 30, and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brounley (U.S. Patent No. 5,473,291) in view of Thornton et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,441,092). Claims 2 and 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brounley in view of Thornton et al. and further in view of Wickramanayaka et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,462,482). Next, the Examiner rejected claims 3, 4, 39, and 40 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brounley in view of Thornton et al. and further in view of Saliman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,656,123). Claims 5 and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brounley in view of Thornton et al. and further in view of Singh (U.S. Patent No. 5,309,063). The Examiner also rejected claims 6 and 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brounley in view of Thornton et al. and further in view of Chen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,155,199). Further, claims 7 and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brounley in view of Thornton et al. and further in view of Imahashi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,537,004). Additionally, the Examiner rejected claims 8 and 37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brounley in view of Thornton et al. and further in view of Keller et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,767,291). Claim 22 was additionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brounley in view of Thornton et al. and further in view of Mavreti et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,424,232). The Examiner rejected claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brounley in view of Thornton et al. and further in view of Kondo et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,462,628). Claim 26 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brounley in view of Thornton et al. and further in view of Ball et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,315,611). The Examiner rejected claim 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brounley in view of Thornton et al. and further in view of Williams et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,889,252). Claims 33 and 43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brounley in view of Thornton et al. and further in view of Hong (U.S. Patent No. 6,695,954). Next, the Examiner rejected claim 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brounley in view of Thornton et al. and further in view of Shamouilian et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,095,084). In addition to these rejections, the Examiner rejected claims 45-58, 61, 62, 66, 67, 68, 71, and 72 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Collins et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,392,018) in view of Van Gogh et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,579,426). The Examiner also rejected claim 63 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Collins et al. in view of Van Gogh et al. and further in view of Hong. Claim 64 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Collins et al. in view of Van Gogh et al. and further in view of Shamouilian et al. Furthermore, the Examiner rejected claim 65 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Collins et al. in view of Van Gogh et al. and further in view of Ball et al. The Applicant respectfully disagrees with each of these rejections and, therefore, respectfully traverses the same.

In the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that claims 29, 42, 44, 59, 60, and 70 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. While the Applicant has noted disagreement with the rejections, the Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 32, and 45 to include the limitations formerly recited by claim 29. With this change, the Applicant believes that all of claims 1-28 and 30-72 are now in a condition for allowance. As such, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the rejections of the claims, withdraw the rejections, and pass claims 1-28 and 30-72 to allowance.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desirable to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Please charge any fees associated with the submission of this paper to Deposit Account Number 033975. The Commissioner for Patents is also authorized to credit any over payments to the above-referenced Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,
PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP



JEFFREY D. KARCESKI
Reg. No. 35914
Tel. No. 202.663.8403
Fax No. 202.663.8007

Date: December 11, 2006
P.O. Box 10500
McLean, VA 22102
(703) 905-2000